



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,656	10/09/2001	Mark Watson	476-2056	6184

23644 7590 06/09/2006
BARNES & THORNBURG, LLP
P.O. BOX 2786
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/973,656

Applicant(s)

WATSON, MARK

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2152

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: none.
Claim(s) objected to: none.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-14.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
the argument is not persuasive.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
13. ☒ Other: see other sheet.


BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Advisory Action

In the remark, applicant argued (1) Borella does not teach “it is at the network address translator bridging the first and second address domains that the step of “retaining the address of the first entity within the first address domain in the call set-up message as well as adding information about the identity of the first address domain to the call set-up message.”

Examiner traverse the argument that:

As to point (1), In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., it is at the network address translator bridging the first and second address domains that the step of retaining... is performed) are not recited in the rejected claims of claims 1-8. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claims are indefinite regarding which device is performing the address retaining and adding information since “receiving the call set-up message at the first network address translator and retaining the address of...” claimed in claim 1 does not clearly show that it is the first network address translator that is performing the retaining step and the information adding step.

Applicant has continuously argued against Borella reference individually and failed to see that Borella reference is relied upon to remedy the lacking of AAPA. AAPA disclosed a network address translator. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). AAPA disclosed an address translator to perform the claimed steps of claims 9 and 12. Although AAPA does not teach the network address translator to comprise “a processor arranged to modify the received call set-up message by adding information about the identity of the first address domain whilst retaining the address...”, such method of retraining address and adding information can be found in Borella's network device. Borella taught a network device to “adds outer IP header to the data packet (e.g. adding information about the identity of the first address domain to the call set-up message) with the source address set to the network device's internal IP address” (e.g. retain the address of the first entity within the first address domain in the call set-up message; the IP address of the network device remain unchanged in the data packet) and “forwards the data packet to router” (e.g. transmit the message to the second network) (col.17, lines 23-41) and that the information (i.e. IP address) in the call set-up message can be used to establish a communications path from the second entity to the first entity (i.e., using the source address incorporated in the message). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of retraining address and information adding in Borella's network device to the network address translator of AAPA (e.g. also a network address) to provide the retraining and information adding feature to the network address translator. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of AAPA and Borella because Borella's teaching of adding header with source address and destination address enables AAPA to further insert data into the call set-up message and allows the receivers to identify the sender by using the addresses incorporated in the message. Furthermore, since AAPA taught the

Art Unit: 2152

use of call set-up message, where a call set-up message can be a data packet, it would then have been obvious to use Borella's teaching of network address translating method in combination with AAPA's teaching to add IP header information to the call set-up messages to forward the call set-up message to the destination.